

MARY McCONN.

JUNE 14, 1898.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted the following

ADVERSE REPORT.

[To accompany S. 2376.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2376) granting a pension to Mary McConn, have examined the same and report:

This woman alleges that she is the mother of Michael Hayes, who is shown by the records of the War Department to have enlisted in Company B, Eighth Connecticut Volunteers, on September 27, 1861. He was wounded at the battle of Antietam September 17, 1862, and was discharged October 6, 1864. He was treated for deafness, gunshot wound of arm, and diarrhea while in the service.

He filed and established a claim for pension on account of gunshot wound of right forearm, and has been pensioned therefor at \$8 from discharge, increased to \$12 from September 1, 1880, and to \$16 from May 6, 1891. He died April 11, 1894.

This claimant filed a claim under the general law as dependent mother on October 19, 1894, alleging that soldier "contracted chronic catarrh of the head, from which he never recovered, but which finally caused insanity and brought on meningitis, which was the immediate cause of his death." This claim was rejected November 24, 1896, "on the ground of claimant's declared inability to furnish competent evidence to connect the soldier's death with his military service and line of duty."

The cause of death is reported by the surgeon of the Government Hospital for the Insane, Washington, D. C., as "chronic mania, with leptomeningitis."

Claimant has furnished lay evidence of origin of catarrh in the service, but no medical evidence as to origin or continuance, and she seems to be unable to in any way connect death of the soldier with the service.

None of the other points necessary to establish a mother's claim under the general law are covered by evidence. It is not shown that she is the mother of the soldier, or that she is now or was dependent at the time of his death.

If a fair showing could be made by medical or other testimony the Pension Office would have the claim specially examined, but on the present showing that would not be warranted.

There is no reason why Congressional action should be taken.